arXiv:1607.02208v1 [math.AG] 8 Jul 2016

THE REGULAR SEMISIMPLE LOCUS OF THE AFFINE QUOTIENT OF THE COTANGENT BUNDLE OF THE GROTHENDIECK-SPRINGER RESOLUTION

MEE SEONG IM

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathfrak{b} = \mathrm{Lie}(B)$ where B is the set of invertible upper triangular matrices in $GL_n(\mathbb{C})$. For $\mu : T^*(\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n) \to \mathfrak{b}^*$ where $\mathfrak{b}^* = \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{n}$ and $\mathfrak{n}$ being strictly upper triangular matrices, we prove that $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}/\!\!/B$ is smooth, affine, reduced, and scheme-theoretically isomorphic to a dense open locus of $\mathbb{C}^{2n}$. The B-invariant functions on the regular semisimple locus of the Hamiltonian reduction of $\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n$ arise as the trace of a certain product of matrices.

1. Introduction

Let B be the set of all upper triangular matrices in the general linear group $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$. We will call B the Borel subgroup, or the Borel. Let $\mathfrak{b} = \mathrm{Lie}(B)$. Let B act on the vector space $\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n$ via $b.(r, i) = (brb^{-1}, bi)$. This action is induced onto the cotangent bundle $T^*(\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n) = \mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{b}^* \times \mathbb{C}^n \times (\mathbb{C}^n)^*$ of $\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n$ as:

$$b.(r, s, i, j) = (\mathrm{Ad}_b(r), \mathrm{Ad}^*_b(s), bi, jb^{-1}) = (brb^{-1}, bsb^{-1}, bi, jb^{-1}).$$

The infinitesimal action of B induces the map $a : \mathfrak{b} \to Vect(\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n)$ which is given as $a(v)(r, i) = \frac{d}{dt}(g_t.(r, i))|_{t=0} = ([v, r], vi)$, where $g_t = \exp(tv)$. Dualizing this map gives us the moment map $\mu : T^*(\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n) \to \mathfrak{b}^*$, where (r, s, i, j) is mapped to $\mathrm{ad}^*_r(s) + \overline{ij}$, which is $[r, s] + \overline{ij}$ in our setting, with $\overline{v} : \mathfrak{g}^* \to \mathfrak{b}^*$ being the projection map. For each algebraic character $\chi : B \to \mathbb{C}^*$, we would like to understand the Hamiltonian reduction $\mu^{-1}(0)/\!\!/_\chi B$ of $\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n$ twisted by χ (for various χ) and relate the scheme to other well-known schemes, such as, the Hilbert scheme of n points on a complex plane ([Nak99], [Gin09]), etc. The space $T^*(\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n)$ can also be viewed as a certain filtered quiver representation space ([Im14]), which appears in the study of KLR-algebras ([KL09], [KL11], [Rou08], [SW11]) and in Lusztig's geometric representation of the upper half U^+ of the universal enveloping algebra of a Kac-Moody algebra ([Lus90a], [Lus90b], [Lus00]), but we will not discuss the details here.

Another main motivation for an interest in understanding the affine and GIT quotients of the above moment map is because $\mu^{-1}(0)/B$ is isomorphic to the cotangent bundle $T^*(G \times_B \mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n/G)$, where $G = GL(n, \mathbb{C})$. We refer the reader to [Nev11] for the construction of the cotangent bundle of the Grothendieck-Springer resolution and to Chapter 3 of [CG10] and Section 6 of [Gin98] for some background on the Grothendieck-Springer resolution.

We give partial results here by restricting $\mathfrak{b}$ to its regular semisimple locus.

Definition 1.1. *Let $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$ be the set of quadruples*

$$\{(r, s, i, j) \in \mu^{-1}(0) : r \text{ has distinct eigenvalues}\}.$$

Let $r = (r_{\iota\gamma})$ be an $n \times n$ matrix. We write $\mathrm{diag}(r)$ to mean the diagonal matrix with entries $(r_{11}, r_{22}, \ldots, r_{nn})$ along its main diagonal.

Let I_n be the $n \times n$ identity matrix.

Proposition 1.2. *For (r, s, i, j) in $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$, choose $b \in B$ as in Proposition 2.15 so that $(brb^{-1}$, bsb^{-1}, bi, $jb^{-1}) = (\mathrm{diag}(r)$, s', i', $j')$. We prove in Proposition 2.17 that each diagonal coordinate function of $s' = (s'_{\iota\gamma})$ is*

$$s'_{\iota\iota} = \left[\mathrm{tr}\left(\prod_{1 \le k \le n, k \neq \iota} l_k(r)\right)\right]^{-1} \mathrm{tr}\left(\prod_{1 \le k \le n, k \neq \iota} l_k(r)\, s\right),$$

where $l_k(r) = r - r_{kk}\,\mathrm{I}_n$.

Date: July 11, 2016.

Notation 1.3. *We denote* $\Delta_n \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ *to be the set* $\{(x_{11}, \ldots, x_{nn}, 0, \ldots, 0) : x_{\iota\iota} = x_{\gamma\gamma}$ *for some* $\iota \neq \gamma\}$.

Thus $\mathbb{C}^{2n} \setminus \Delta_n$ is the locus $\{(x_{11}, \ldots, x_{nn}, y_{11}, \ldots, y_{nn}) : x_{\iota\iota} \neq x_{\gamma\gamma}$ whenever $\iota \neq \gamma\}$. We now state the main Propositions proved in this paper.

Proposition 1.4. *The map* $P : \mu^{-1}(0)^{rss} \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2n} \setminus \Delta_n$ *given by sending*

$$(r, s, i, j) \mapsto (r_{11}, \ldots, r_{nn}, s'_{11}, \ldots, s'_{nn}),$$

where $s'_{\iota\iota}$ *is defined as in Proposition 1.2, is a regular, well-defined, and* B*-invariant surjective map separating orbit closures.*

Proposition 1.5. *The map given in Proposition 1.4, which descends to a set-theoretic bijective homeomorphism* $p : \mu^{-1}(0)^{rss} /\!\!/ B \to \mathbb{C}^{2n} \setminus \Delta_n$*, where*

$$\overline{B.(r, s, i, j)} \mapsto (r_{11}, \ldots, r_{nn}, s'_{11}, \ldots, s'_{nn})$$

with $s'_{\iota\iota}$ *given as above, induces an isomorphism of varieties.*

1.1. **Acknowledgment.** The author would like to thank Thomas Nevins for discussions on research problems in representation theory and algebraic geometry and for numerous fruitful discussions. The author was supported by NSA grant H98230-12-1-0216, by Campus Research Board, and by NSF grant DMS 08-38434.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Orthonormal projection operators in** B**.** We begin with a discussion of a certain set of orthonormal projection operators in B.

Notation 2.1. *We will use the convention that an empty sum is defined to be 0 while an empty product is defined to be 1; that is,*

$$\sum_{k=\iota}^{\gamma} f(k) := 0 \text{ and } \prod_{k=\iota}^{\gamma} f(k) := 1$$

if $\gamma < \iota$*. We also like to remark that*

$$\sum_{\iota < k_1 < \ldots < k_v < \mu} f(k_i) := 0$$

if $v \geq \mu - \iota$*.*

Notation 2.2. *For* $l_k(r) = r - r_{kk}\,\mathrm{I}_n$*, we will write*

$$L^{\iota} := \left[\mathrm{tr} \left(\prod_{1 \leq k \leq n, k \neq \iota} l_k(r) \right) \right]^{-1} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n, k \neq \iota} l_k(r)$$

and will write

$$L^{\iota}_{\gamma\mu} := \left(\left[\mathrm{tr} \left(\prod_{1 \leq k \leq n, k \neq \iota} l_k(r) \right) \right]^{-1} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n, k \neq \iota} l_k(r) \right)_{\gamma\mu}$$

to denote coordinate functions of L^{ι}*.*

For Lemma 2.10 and in Section 5.2 (Prop 5.8 and 5.9), we will write $L^{\iota}(r)$ instead of L^{ι} since L^{ι} depends on r.

Lemma 2.3. *The* L^{ι}*'s form mutually orthonormal projection matrices. That is, we have*

$$\det(L^{\iota}) = 1, \ \left(L^{\iota}\right)^2 = L^{\iota} \quad \text{and} \quad L^{\iota} L^{\gamma} = 0$$

for any $\iota \neq \gamma$*. In particular, any row of* L^{ι} *is orthogonal to any column of* L^{γ} *for* $\iota \neq \gamma$*.*

Proof. It is clear that $\det(L^\iota) = 1$ since $L^\iota_{\mu\alpha} = 0$ if $\mu > \iota$ or $\alpha < \iota$, and the only nonzero diagonal entry is $L^\iota_{\iota\iota} = 1$.

Suppose $\iota = \gamma$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &L^\iota_{\mu\alpha} = 0 \text{ if } \mu > \iota \text{ or } \alpha < \iota, \text{ and} \\ &L^\iota_{\alpha\nu} = 0 \text{ if } \alpha > \iota \text{ or } \nu < \iota. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} \left(L^\iota L^\iota\right)_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} L^\iota_{\mu\alpha} L^\iota_{\alpha\nu} \quad &\overset{\text{by (1)}}{=} \quad \sum_{\alpha=\iota}^{\iota} L^\iota_{\mu\alpha} L^\iota_{\alpha\nu} = L^\iota_{\mu\iota} L^\iota_{\iota\nu} \\ &= \begin{cases} L^\iota_{\mu\iota} = L^\iota_{\mu\nu} & \text{if } \mu < \iota, \nu = \iota \\ 1 \ = L^\iota_{\mu\nu} & \text{if } \mu = \iota, \nu = \iota \\ L^\iota_{\iota\nu} = L^\iota_{\mu\nu} & \text{if } \mu = \iota, \nu > \iota \\ \qquad\ L^\iota_{\mu\nu} & \text{if } \mu < \iota, \nu > \iota \\ 0 \ = L^\iota_{\mu\nu} & \text{if } \mu > \iota \text{ or } \nu < \iota. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

It is a direct calculation to show that $L^\iota_{\mu\iota} L^\iota_{\iota\nu} = L^\iota_{\mu\nu}$. Thus $\left(L^\iota\right)^2 = L^\iota$.

For $\iota > \gamma$,

$$\left(L^\iota L^\gamma\right)_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} L^\iota_{\mu\alpha} L^\gamma_{\alpha\nu} = 0$$

since $L^\iota_{\mu\alpha} = 0$ for each $\alpha < \iota$ and $L^\gamma_{\alpha\nu} = 0$ for each $\alpha > \gamma$. Thus $L^\iota L^\gamma = 0$ whenever $\iota > \gamma$.

Finally for $\iota < \gamma$,

$$L^\iota L^\gamma = L^\gamma L^\iota = 0$$

since L^ι's commute and by previous case. □

We like to note that L^ι's in Lemma 2.3 are n idempotents satisfying $\sum_{\iota=1}^{n} L^\iota = \mathrm{I}_n$.

Corollary 2.4. *The product of matrices* $\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)$ *and* $\prod_{1\le \widetilde{k}\le n, \widetilde{k}\neq\gamma} l_{\widetilde{k}}(r)$ *is zero for any* $\iota \neq \gamma$. *In particular, any row of*

$$\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)$$

is orthogonal to any column of

$$\prod_{1\le \widetilde{k}\le n, \widetilde{k}\neq\gamma} l_{\widetilde{k}}(r)$$

for $\iota \neq \gamma$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 2.3 by clearing the denominators of L^ι and L^γ. □

Lemma 2.5. *For each* $1 \le \iota \le n$, $\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)$ *is zero strictly to the left of* ι^{th} *column or strictly below* ι^{th} *row.*

Proof. This follows by direct calculation. □

Lemma 2.6. *For each* γ *and* $r \in \mathfrak{b}$, $\left(L^\iota r\right)_{\gamma\gamma} = \left(rL^\iota\right)_{\gamma\gamma} = r_{\iota\iota} L^\iota_{\gamma\gamma}$.

Proof. For a fixed ι, it is clear that $L^\iota r = rL^\iota$ since r and L^ι commute. We will thus show for each γ, $(L^\iota r)_{\gamma\gamma} = r_{\iota\iota} L^\iota_{\gamma\gamma}$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
(L^\iota r)_{\gamma\gamma} &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n} L^\iota_{\gamma\mu} r_{\mu\gamma} \\
&= \sum_{\mu=\iota}^{n} L^\iota_{\gamma\mu} r_{\mu\gamma} \text{ since } L^\iota_{\gamma\mu} = 0 \quad \text{for } \mu < \iota \\
&= \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{\mu=\iota}^{n} 0 \cdot r_{\mu\gamma} = 0 = r_{\iota\iota} L^\iota_{\gamma\gamma} & \text{if } \gamma > \iota \\ \displaystyle\sum_{\mu=\iota}^{n} L^\iota_{\gamma\mu} r_{\mu\gamma} \overset{\dagger}{=} \sum_{\mu=\iota}^{\iota} L^\iota_{\iota\mu} r_{\mu\iota} = r_{\iota\iota} \cdot 1 = r_{\iota\iota} L^\iota_{\gamma\gamma} & \text{if } \gamma = \iota \\ \displaystyle\sum_{\mu=\iota}^{n} L^\iota_{\gamma\mu} r_{\mu\gamma} \overset{\ddagger}{=} \sum_{\mu=\iota}^{n} L^\iota_{\gamma\mu} \cdot 0 = r_{\iota\iota} L^\iota_{\gamma\gamma} & \text{if } \gamma < \iota, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where † holds since $r_{\mu\gamma} = 0$ for all $\mu > \gamma$ and since $\gamma = \iota$, and ‡ holds since $r_{\mu\gamma} = 0$ for all $\mu > \gamma$ and since μ ranges over $\iota \le \mu \le n$. □

Lemma 2.7. *For each ι and for any $r \in \mathfrak{b}$, $\prod_{k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\, r = r \prod_{k\neq\iota} l_k(r)$ is zero strictly to the left of ι^{th} column or strictly below ι^{th} row.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(L^\iota r)_{\gamma\nu} &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n} L^\iota_{\gamma\mu} r_{\mu\nu} \\
&= \sum_{\mu=\iota}^{n} L^\iota_{\gamma\mu} r_{\mu\nu} \text{ since } L^\iota_{\gamma\mu} = 0 \quad \text{for } \mu < \iota \\
&= \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{\mu=\iota}^{n} 0 \cdot r_{\mu\nu} = 0 & \text{if } \gamma > \iota \\ \displaystyle\sum_{\mu=\iota}^{n} L^\iota_{\gamma\mu} r_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{\mu=\iota}^{n} L^\iota_{\gamma\mu} \cdot 0 = 0 & \text{if } \gamma \le \iota, \nu < \iota \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

since $r_{\mu\nu} = 0$ for each $\mu > \nu$. Clear the denominator to obtain the result. □

Lemma 2.8. *For each ι and for any $s \in \mathfrak{b}^*$,*

$$\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\, s$$

is zero strictly below ι^{th} row.

Unlike the case in Lemma 2.7, we make a note that $\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\, s$ is not zero strictly to the left of ι^{th} column.

Proof. For $\gamma > \iota$,

$$\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\, s \right)_{\gamma\mu} = \sum_{\kappa=1}^{n} \left(\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r) \right)_{\gamma\kappa} s_{\kappa\mu} \overset{\dagger}{=} \sum_{\kappa=1}^{n} 0 \cdot s_{\kappa\mu} = 0$$

where † holds by Lemma 2.5. □

The following Corollary will be used in the proof of Proposition 2.17.

Corollary 2.9. *For each $\gamma > \iota$, $(L^\iota s)_{\gamma\mu} = 0$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 2.8. □

We will see an application of the following Lemma in Section 5.2.

Lemma 2.10. *For any $d \in B$, $L^\iota(d.r) = d.L^\iota(r)$, where the B-action on the operator is by conjugation.*

Proof. For any $d \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned} L^\iota(d.r) &= \left[\operatorname{tr}\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} drd^{-1} - r_{kk}\,\mathrm{I}_n\right)\right]^{-1}\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} drd^{-1} - r_{kk}\,\mathrm{I}_n\right) \\ &= \left[\operatorname{tr}\left(d\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} r - r_{kk}\,\mathrm{I}_n\right)d^{-1}\right)\right]^{-1} d\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} r - r_{kk}\,\mathrm{I}_n\right)d^{-1} \\ &= d\left(\left[\operatorname{tr}\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} r - r_{kk}\,\mathrm{I}_n\right)\right]^{-1}\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota}(r - r_{kk}\,\mathrm{I}_n)\right)d^{-1} \\ &= d.L^\iota(r) \end{aligned}$$

□

2.2. **On the fixed points by the Borel.** We now prove some basic facts about the action of B. Proposition 2.11 shows that the diagonal entries of an upper triangular matrix do not change under the B-conjugation action whilst Lemma 2.12 shows that diagonal entries of a diagonal matrix are preserved under the B-conjugation action.

Proposition 2.11. *For any r in $\mathfrak{b}$ and for any b in B, we have* $\operatorname{diag}(brb^{-1}) = \operatorname{diag}(r)$.

Proof. Denote the entries of b, r, and b^{-1} as $b_{\iota\gamma}$, $r_{\iota\gamma}$, and $b'_{\iota\gamma}$, respectively, with $b'_{\iota\iota} = b_{\iota\iota}^{-1}$. Then $(br)_{\iota\gamma} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} b_{\iota k} r_{k\gamma}$. Since $b_{\iota k}$ and $r_{\iota k}$ equal 0 whenever $\iota > k$,

$$(br)_{\iota\gamma} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=\iota}^{\gamma} b_{\iota k} r_{k\gamma} & \text{if } \iota < \gamma \\ b_{\iota\iota} r_{\iota\iota} & \text{if } \iota = \gamma \\ 0 & \text{if } \iota > \gamma. \end{cases}$$

Renaming $(br)_{\iota k}$ as $d_{\iota k}$, we obtain $(brb^{-1})_{\iota\gamma} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} d_{\iota k} b'_{k\gamma}$. Since $d_{\iota k}$ and $b'_{\iota k}$ equal 0 whenever $\iota > k$,

$$(brb^{-1})_{\iota\gamma} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=\iota}^{\gamma} d_{\iota k} b'_{k\gamma} & \text{if } \iota < \gamma \\ d_{\iota\iota} b'_{\iota\iota} & \text{if } \iota = \gamma \\ 0 & \text{if } \iota > \gamma. \end{cases}$$

Since $(brb^{-1})_{\iota\iota} = d_{\iota\iota} b'_{\iota\iota} = b_{\iota\iota} r_{\iota\iota} b_{\iota\iota}^{-1} = r_{\iota\iota}$, we are done. □

Lemma 2.12. *Let $s = \operatorname{diag}(s)$. For any b in B,* $\operatorname{diag}(bsb^{-1}) = \operatorname{diag}(s)$.

Proof. Restrict r in Proposition 2.11 to those in $\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{b}^* = \mathfrak{h}$. □

For a diagonal matrix r in $\mathfrak{b}$ and for a general b in B, brb^{-1} need not equal r (that is, brb^{-1} need not be diagonal). However, for a diagonal matrix s in $\mathfrak{b}^*$ and for any b in B, $bsb^{-1} = s$ (i.e., $b \operatorname{diag}(s)\, b^{-1} = \operatorname{diag}(s)$) always holds in $\mathfrak{b}^* = \mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{n}$ since the strictly upper triangular part is killed in $\mathfrak{b}^*$.

Proposition 2.13. *For each ι, $r_{\iota\iota} = \operatorname{tr}(L^\iota r)$.*

Proof. We have $\operatorname{tr}(L^\iota r) = \operatorname{tr}(r_{\iota\iota} L^\iota) = r_{\iota\iota}$ where the first equality holds by Lemma 2.6 and the second equality holds by direct calculation ($L^\iota_{\gamma\gamma}$ is 0 if $\gamma \neq \iota$ and equals 1 if $\gamma = \iota$). □

Proposition 2.14. *For each* $1 \leq \gamma < \nu \leq n$, $(r_{\nu\nu} - r_{\gamma\gamma})^{-1} = [\mathrm{tr}((L^\nu - L^\gamma)r)]^{-1}$.

Proof. Applying Proposition 2.13, we have $\mathrm{tr}(L^\nu r - L^\gamma r) = \mathrm{tr}(L^\nu r) - \mathrm{tr}(L^\gamma r) = r_{\nu\nu} - r_{\gamma\gamma}$. □

We now apply the operators from Notation 2.2 for the following

Proposition 2.15. *For each* r *in* $\mathfrak{b}^{rss}$, *there exists* b *in the Borel with coordinates*

$$b_{\iota\gamma} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \iota > \gamma \\ b_{\iota\iota} & \text{if } \iota = \gamma \\ b_{\iota\iota}\left(\dfrac{r_{\iota\gamma}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma}} + \displaystyle\sum_{v=1}^{\gamma-\iota-1} \sum_{\iota<k_1<\ldots<k_v<\gamma} \frac{r_{\iota k_1} r_{k_v\gamma}}{(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{k_1k_1})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma})} \prod_{u=1}^{v-1} \frac{r_{k_uk_{u+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{k_{u+1}k_{u+1}}}\right) & \text{if } \iota < \gamma \end{cases}$$

which diagonalizes r. *This* b *can be written as*

$$b = \sum_{\iota=1}^{n} E_{\iota\iota}\ \mathrm{diag}(b) L^\iota, \tag{2}$$

where L^ι *is from Notation 2.2 and* $E_{\iota\iota}$ *has 1 in* (ι,ι)*-entry and* 0*'s elsewhere.*

One may deduce from the proof of Proposition 2.15 that one may replace $\mathrm{diag}(b)$ with b on the right-hand side of (2) and still obtain a matrix that diagonalizes r.

Proof. For $r = (r_{ij})$, we will show $brb^{-1} = \mathrm{diag}(r)$, or equivalently, $br = \mathrm{diag}(r)b$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
br &= \sum_{\iota=1}^{n} \left[\mathrm{tr}\left(\prod_{1\leq k\leq n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right)\right]^{-1} E_{\iota\iota}\ \mathrm{diag}(b)\left(\prod_{1\leq k\leq n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right) r \\
&= \sum_{\iota=1}^{n} \left[\mathrm{tr}\left(\prod_{1\leq k\leq n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right)\right]^{-1} b_{\iota\iota} E_{\iota\iota}\, r \left(\prod_{1\leq k\leq n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right) \\
&= \sum_{\iota=1}^{n} \left[\mathrm{tr}\left(\prod_{1\leq k\leq n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right)\right]^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ b_{\iota\iota}\vec{r}_\iota \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \left(\prod_{1\leq k\leq n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right) \text{ where } \vec{r}_\iota \text{ is the } \iota^{th} \text{ row of } r \\
&= \sum_{\iota=1}^{n} \left[\mathrm{tr}\left(\prod_{1\leq k\leq n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right)\right]^{-1} b_{\iota\iota} r_{\iota\iota} E_{\iota\iota} \left(\prod_{1\leq k\leq n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right) \text{ by Lemma 2.5} \\
&= \sum_{\iota=1}^{n} \left[\mathrm{tr}\left(\prod_{1\leq k\leq n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right)\right]^{-1} \mathrm{diag}(r) E_{\iota\iota}\, \mathrm{diag}(b) \left(\prod_{1\leq k\leq n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right) \\
&= \mathrm{diag}(r)b.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 2.16. *The inverse of* b *in Proposition 2.15 has coordinates*

$$(b^{-1})_{\iota\gamma} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \iota > \gamma \\ b_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} & \text{if } \iota = \gamma \\ b_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1}\left(\dfrac{r_{\iota\gamma}}{r_{\gamma\gamma} - r_{\iota\iota}} + \displaystyle\sum_{v=1}^{\gamma-\iota-1} \sum_{\iota<k_1<\ldots<k_v<\gamma} \frac{r_{\iota k_1} r_{k_v\gamma}}{(r_{\gamma\gamma} - r_{k_vk_v})(r_{\gamma\gamma} - r_{\iota\iota})} \prod_{u=1}^{v-1} \frac{r_{k_uk_{u+1}}}{r_{\gamma\gamma} - r_{k_uk_u}}\right) & \text{if } \iota < \gamma \end{cases}$$

with matrix representation

$$b^{-1} = \sum_{\iota=1}^{n} L^{\iota} \operatorname{diag}(b)^{-1} E_{\iota\iota}.$$

Proof. We will prove that $bb^{-1} = \mathrm{I}_n$. The ι^{th} row of b is $e_\iota^* \operatorname{diag}(b) L^\iota$ and the γ^{th} column of b^{-1} is $L^\gamma \operatorname{diag}(b)^{-1} e_\gamma$ where e_γ is an elementary column vector and e_ι^* is an elementary covector. By Lemma 2.3,

$$e_\iota^* \operatorname{diag}(b) L^\iota L^\gamma \operatorname{diag}(b)^{-1} e_\gamma = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \iota = \gamma \\ 0 & \text{if } \iota \neq \gamma. \end{cases}$$

□

Proposition 2.17. *For each ι,*

$$(bsb^{-1})_{\iota\iota} = \operatorname{tr}(L^\iota s),$$

where b is from Proposition 2.15 and L^ι is from Notation 2.2.

We first sketch a proof for Proposition 2.17. For a fixed ι and for each $\gamma \leq \iota$, consider the entry

$$(bs)_{\iota\gamma} = \sum_{\mu=\iota}^{n} b_{\iota\mu} s_{\mu\gamma}.$$

Then

$$(bsb^{-1})_{\iota\iota} = \sum_{\gamma=1}^{\iota} (bs)_{\iota\gamma} (b^{-1})_{\gamma\iota}$$

since $(bs)_{\iota\gamma}(b^{-1})_{\gamma\iota} = 0$ for each $\gamma > \iota$. Now considering the product of matrices $L^\iota s$, $(L^\iota s)_{\gamma\gamma} = 0$ for all $\gamma > \iota$ by Corollary 2.9. We will thus show

$$(bs)_{\iota\gamma}(b^{-1})_{\gamma\iota} = (L^\iota s)_{\gamma\gamma}$$

for each γ, which implies

$$(bsb^{-1})_{\iota\iota} = \sum_{\gamma=1}^{\iota} \underbrace{(bs)_{\iota\gamma}(b^{-1})_{\gamma\iota}}_{(L^\iota s)_{\gamma\gamma}} = s'_{\iota\iota}.$$

We now prove Proposition 2.17, thus deriving Proposition 1.2.

Proof. Fix ι and let $\gamma \leq \iota$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}(bs)_{\iota\gamma} &= \sum_{\mu=\iota}^{n} b_{\iota\mu} s_{\mu\gamma} \\ &= b_{\iota\iota} s_{\iota\gamma} + \sum_{\mu=\iota+1}^{n} b_{\iota\iota} \left(\frac{r_{\iota\mu}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\mu\mu}} + \sum_{v=1}^{\mu-\iota-1} \sum_{\iota<k_1<\ldots<k_v<\mu} \frac{r_{\iota k_1} r_{k_v \mu}}{(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{k_1 k_1})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\mu\mu})} \prod_{u=1}^{v-1} \frac{r_{k_u k_{u+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{k_{u+1} k_{u+1}}} \right) s_{\mu\gamma},\end{aligned}$$

we have $(bsb^{-1})_{\iota\iota} = \sum_{\gamma=1}^{\iota} (bs)_{\iota\gamma}(b^{-1})_{\gamma\iota} = \operatorname{tr}(L^\iota s)$, where L^ι is given in Notation 2.2. □

Remark 2.18. *Suppose bsb^{-1} is multiplied from right to left than from left to right. That is, for $\gamma \geq \iota$,*

$$(sb^{-1})_{\gamma\iota} = \sum_{\mu=1}^{\iota} s_{\gamma\mu} (b^{-1})_{\mu\iota}$$

with

$$(bsb^{-1})_{\iota\iota} = \sum_{\gamma=\iota}^{n} b_{\iota\gamma} (sb^{-1})_{\gamma\iota},$$

then we have

$$b_{\iota\gamma}(sb^{-1})_{\gamma\iota} = (sL^\iota)_{\gamma\gamma},$$

and similar as before, for $\gamma < \iota$,

$$b_{\iota\gamma}(sb^{-1})_{\gamma\iota} = 0 = (sL^\iota)_{\gamma\gamma}.$$

3. B-orbits on the rss-locus

We now analyze the affine quotient of $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$ by B.

Proposition 3.1. *For $(r, s, 0, 0)$ in $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$, s is diagonal.*

We prove Proposition 3.1 using strong induction.

Proof. Let $r = (r_{\iota\gamma})$ and $s = (s_{\iota\gamma})$. Let $n = 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}[r,s] &= \begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} \\ 0 & r_{22} \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & 0 \\ s_{21} & s_{22} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & 0 \\ s_{21} & s_{22} \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} \\ 0 & r_{22} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} r_{11}s_{11} + r_{12}s_{21} & * \\ r_{22}s_{21} & r_{22}s_{22} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} r_{11}s_{11} & * \\ r_{11}s_{21} & r_{22}s_{22} + s_{21}r_{12} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} r_{12}s_{21} & * \\ (r_{22} - r_{11})s_{21} & -s_{21}r_{12} \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $r \in \mathfrak{b}^{rss}$, $s_{21} = 0$ and since $s = \mathrm{diag}(s)$, we are done.

Now assuming that the proposition holds when the rank of r is $n-1$, consider r' and s' where

$$r' = \begin{pmatrix} r & r_{\iota n} \\ 0 & r_{nn} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } s' = \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 \\ s_{n\gamma} & s_{nn} \end{pmatrix},$$

which are $n \times n$ matrices whose upper left block are matrices r and s, respectively, with $(r', s', 0, 0)$ in $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$. Then $[r', s'] = 0$ in $\mathfrak{b}^*$, and r_{nn} distinct from r_{ll} for all $l < n$. So

$$([r', s'])_{\iota\gamma} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \iota < \gamma \\ (r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma})s_{\iota\gamma} + \sum_{k>\iota} r_{\iota k}s_{k\gamma} - \sum_{k<\gamma} s_{\iota k}r_{k\gamma} & \text{if } \iota \geq \gamma. \end{cases}$$

We rewrite $[r', s']$ as the sum

$$\begin{pmatrix} [r,s] & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$+ \begin{pmatrix} r_{1n}s_{n1} & & & & \\ r_{2n}s_{n1} & r_{2n}s_{n2} & & & \\ r_{3n}s_{n1} & r_{3n}s_{n2} & r_{3n}s_{n3} & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & & & \\ r_{\iota n}s_{n1} & r_{\iota n}s_{n2} & r_{\iota n}s_{n3} & \ddots & \\ \vdots & \vdots & & & \\ (r_{nn} - r_{11})s_{n1} & (r_{nn} - r_{22})s_{n2} - s_{n1}r_{12} & (r_{nn} - r_{33})s_{n3} - \sum_{\iota=1}^{2} s_{n\iota}r_{\iota 3} & & -\sum_{k<n} s_{nk}r_{kn} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $[r, s] = 0$, the large matrix on the right hand side of the sum equals zero. Now consider the entry in the lower left corner of the large matrix. Since the eigenvalues of r' are pairwise distinct, $s_{n1} = 0$. Moving over one column to the right, and remaining in the last row, we see that $s_{n2} = 0$ as well. Continue recursively until we get to the last column in the large matrix: each term in the sum in the bottom right entry equals zero since each $s_{nk} = 0$ for all $k < n$. By the strong induction hypothesis, $s = \mathrm{diag}(s)$ and by the above argument, $s' = \mathrm{diag}(s')$ and this completes the proof. □

Corollary 3.2. *If (r, s, i, j) is in $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$ with i or j equaling zero, then s is diagonal.*

Proof. This is immediate from Proposition 3.1. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let $(r, s, 0, 0)$ be in $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$. Then there exists $b \in B$ such that $(brb^{-1}, bsb^{-1}, 0, 0) = (\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s), 0, 0)$.*

We note the subtlety in Lemma 3.3 that the B-action on the points in $B.(r, s, 0, 0)$ does not change the diagonal coordinates of r and s.

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, s is diagonal. By Proposition 2.15, there exists a matrix b in the Borel so that brb^{-1} is diagonal. By the second statement after Lemma 2.12, we see that bsb^{-1} in $\mathfrak{b}^*$ is always diagonal. By Proposition 2.11 and Lemma 2.12, we see that the diagonal coordinates of r and s are not affected by the B-action. □

Proposition 3.4. *Each B-orbit containing the quadruple $(r, s, 0, 0)$, where r is regular semisimple and the commutator of r and s is zero, is closed.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, s must be diagonal. Choose an appropriate 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t)$ so that

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \lambda(t).(r, \mathrm{diag}(s), 0, 0) = (\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s), 0, 0).$$

Since $(\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s), 0, 0)$ is in the B-orbit by Lemma 3.3, we are done. □

Corollary 3.5. *The affine quotient $\{(r, s, 0, 0) : r \text{ regular}, [r, s] = 0\}/\!\!/B$ consists of closed orbits.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 3.4. □

Corollary 3.6. *If the points $(\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s), 0, 0)$ and $(\mathrm{diag}(r'), \mathrm{diag}(s'), 0, 0)$ are distinct, then the B-orbits $B.(\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s), 0, 0)$ and $B.(\mathrm{diag}(r'), \mathrm{diag}(s'), 0, 0)$ are disjoint.*

Proof. Suppose the B-orbits are not disjoint. We will show that the quadruples $(\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s), 0, 0)$ are $(\mathrm{diag}(r'), \mathrm{diag}(s'), 0, 0)$ are the same point in $T^*(\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n)$. By assumption, the intersection of the B-orbits is nomempty, so choose $b \in B$ so that $b.(\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s), 0, 0) = (\mathrm{diag}(r'), \mathrm{diag}(s'), 0, 0)$. This implies $(b\,\mathrm{diag}(r)b^{-1}, b\,\mathrm{diag}(s)b^{-1}, 0, 0) = (\mathrm{diag}(r'),\ \mathrm{diag}(s'),\ 0,\ 0)$. Setting the first coordinates equal, $b\,\mathrm{diag}(r)b^{-1} = \mathrm{diag}(r')$. So $b\,\mathrm{diag}(r)b^{-1}$ is diagonal. By Lemma 2.12, $\mathrm{diag}(r)$ is fixed under the B-action: $b\,\mathrm{diag}(r)b^{-1} = \mathrm{diag}(r) = \mathrm{diag}(r')$. Next, we see that $b\,\mathrm{diag}(s)b^{-1} = \mathrm{diag}(s) = \mathrm{diag}(s')$, where the first equality holds by the second sentence after Lemma 2.12. □

Remark 3.7. *Proposition 3.8 together with Proposition 3.4 show that all closed B-orbits in $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$ contain points of the form, and thus must be of the form, $(r, s, 0, 0)$.*

Proposition 3.8. *Each orbit closure in $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}/\!\!/B$ contains a point of the form $(\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s'), 0, 0)$.*

Proof. For (r, s, i, j) be in $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$, we will show that there exists a quadruple of the form $(\mathrm{diag}(r),$ $\mathrm{diag}(s'),\ 0,\ 0)$ in its B-orbit closure, where s' is some other element in $\mathfrak{b}^*$.

Firstly, consider points of the form $(r, s, 0, 0)$. By Lemma 3.3, we are done. Thus consider points of the form (r, s, i, j) in $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$ with i or j not necessarily 0. By Proposition 2.15, there is $b \in B$ so that $(brb^{-1}, bsb^{-1}, bi, jb^{-1}) = (\mathrm{diag}(r), s', i', j')$. Let us write $r = (r_{\iota\gamma})$, $s' = (s'_{\iota\gamma})$, $i' = (x'_\iota)$, and $j' = (y'_\iota)$. Since μ is B-equivariant, $[r, s] + ij = 0$ implies $[\mathrm{diag}(r), s'] + i'j' = 0$ in $\mathfrak{b}^*$. Since

$$([\mathrm{diag}(r), s'] + i'j')_{\iota\gamma} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \iota < \gamma \\ x'_\iota y'_\iota & \text{if } \iota = \gamma \\ (r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma})s'_{\iota\gamma} + x'_\iota y'_\gamma & \text{if } \iota > \gamma, \end{cases}$$

$x'_\iota = 0$ or $y'_\iota = 0$ for each ι. At this point, we give a recipe for choosing the a_ι's in the 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda(t) = \mathrm{diag}(t^{a_1}, \ldots, t^{a_n})$ where $a_\iota \in \mathbb{Z}$. Choose

$$a_\iota = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x'_\iota \neq 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } y'_\iota \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x'_\iota = y'_\iota = 0. \end{cases}$$

Now consider $\lambda(t).(\mathrm{diag}(r), s', i', j')$, which equals

$$\left(\mathrm{diag}(r), \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & t^{a_\iota - a_\gamma} s'_{\iota\gamma} & \ddots \\ & & & s_{nn} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} t^{a_1} x'_1 \\ \vdots \\ t^{a_n} x'_n \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} t^{-a_1} y'_1 & \ldots & t^{-a_n} y'_n \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

If $x'_\iota \neq 0$, then we have tx'_ι. If $y'_\gamma \neq 0$, then we also have ty'_γ. If $s'_{\iota\gamma} \neq 0$, then since $s'_{\iota\gamma} = -x'_\iota y'_\gamma/(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma})$, we have $t^2 s'_{\iota\gamma}$. We conclude

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \lambda(t).(\mathrm{diag}(r), s', i', j') = (\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s'), 0, 0).$$

□

The proof for Proposition 1.4 includes showing that the closure of each B-orbit on $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}/\!\!/B$ contains at most one point of the form $(\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s'), 0, 0)$.

Remark 3.9. *It is clear that if $\overline{B.P_1} \cap \overline{B.P_2} = \varnothing$ where $P_1, P_2 \in T^*(\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n)$, then $B.P_1 \cap B.P_2 = \varnothing$.*

4. Proof of Proposition 1.4

We now prove Proposition 1.4.

Proof. It is clear that P is regular and by Proposition 2.11 and 2.17, P is B-invariant. By Remark 3.7, closed orbits are precisely those that contain a point of the form $(r, s, 0, 0)$ as orbits that contain a point of the form (r, s, i, j), where i or j is nonzero, are not closed. Since each closed orbit contains a unique point of the form $(\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s), 0, 0)$ by Lemma 3.3 and by Corollary 3.6, it is clear that two such points go to different points in $\mathbb{C}^{2n} \setminus \Delta_n$ via the map P. In particular, we see that two B-orbits $B.(\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s), 0, 0)$ and $B.(\mathrm{diag}(r'), \mathrm{diag}(s'), 0, 0)$ cannot be in the same B-orbit closure for if it were nonempty, then two such closed orbits would not be separated by P. Thus each B-orbit closure contains a unique closed orbit, and exactly 1 point of the form $(\mathrm{diag}(r), \mathrm{diag}(s), 0, 0)$. Thus P is injective on orbit closures.

We will now show that P is surjective. Consider $(x_{11}, \ldots, x_{nn}, y_{11}, \ldots, y_{nn})$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2n} \setminus \Delta_n$. A point (r, s, i, j) in $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$ is constrained by $[r, s] + ij = 0$. Since

$$([r,s] + ij)_{\iota\gamma} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \iota < \gamma \\ \displaystyle\sum_{\iota < k \leq n} r_{\iota k} s_{k\iota} - \sum_{1 \leq k < \iota} s_{\iota k} r_{k\iota} + x_\iota y_\iota & \text{if } \iota = \gamma \\ \displaystyle\sum_{\iota \leq k \leq n} r_{\iota k} s_{k\gamma} - \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \gamma} s_{\iota k} r_{k\gamma} + x_\iota y_\gamma & \text{if } \iota > \gamma, \end{cases}$$

none of the coordinate functions of $[r, s] + ij$ involve $s_{\iota\iota}$'s. So $s_{\iota\iota}$ is a free parameter. Take $s_{\iota\iota}$ to equal

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\iota\iota} = y_{\iota\iota} - \Bigg[& \sum_{\mu=\iota+1}^{n} \left(\frac{r_{\iota\mu} s_{\mu\iota}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\mu\mu}} + \sum_{v=1}^{\mu-\iota-1} \sum_{\iota < k_1 < \ldots < k_v < \mu} \frac{r_{\iota k_1} r_{k_v \mu} s_{\mu\iota}}{(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{k_1 k_1})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\mu\mu})} \prod_{u=1}^{v-1} \frac{r_{k_u k_{u+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{k_{u+1} k_{u+1}}} \right) \\ & + \sum_{\gamma=1}^{\iota-1} \Bigg[\frac{r_{\gamma\iota} s_{\iota\gamma}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma}} + \sum_{\widetilde{v}=1}^{\iota-\gamma-1} \sum_{\gamma < l_1 < \ldots < l_{\widetilde{v}} < \iota} \frac{r_{\gamma l_1} r_{l_{\widetilde{v}} \iota} s_{\iota\gamma}}{(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{l_{\widetilde{v}} l_{\widetilde{v}}})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma})} \prod_{\widetilde{u}=1}^{\widetilde{v}-1} \frac{r_{l_{\widetilde{u}} l_{\widetilde{u}+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{l_{\widetilde{u}} l_{\widetilde{u}}}} \\ & + \sum_{\mu=\iota+1}^{n} \frac{r_{\gamma\iota} r_{\iota\mu} s_{\mu\gamma}}{(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\mu\mu})} + \sum_{\mu=\iota+1}^{n} \sum_{\widetilde{v}=1}^{\iota-\gamma-1} \sum_{\gamma < l_1 < \ldots < l_{\widetilde{v}} < \iota} \frac{r_{\gamma l_1} r_{l_{\widetilde{v}} \iota} r_{\iota\mu} s_{\mu\gamma}}{(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{l_{\widetilde{v}} l_{\widetilde{v}}})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\mu\mu})} \prod_{\widetilde{u}=1}^{\widetilde{v}-1} \frac{r_{l_{\widetilde{u}} l_{\widetilde{u}+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{l_{\widetilde{u}} l_{\widetilde{u}}}} \\ & + \sum_{\mu=\iota+1}^{n} \sum_{v=1}^{\mu-\iota-1} \sum_{\iota < k_1 < \ldots < k_v < \mu} \frac{r_{\gamma\iota} r_{\iota k_1} r_{k_v \mu} s_{\mu\gamma}}{(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{k_1 k_1})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\mu\mu})} \prod_{u=1}^{v-1} \frac{r_{k_u k_{u+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{k_{u+1} k_{u+1}}} \\ & + \sum_{\mu=\iota+1}^{n} \sum_{v=1}^{\mu-\iota-1} \sum_{\iota < k_1 < \ldots < k_v < \mu} \sum_{\widetilde{v}=1}^{\iota-\gamma-1} \sum_{\gamma < l_1 < \ldots < l_{\widetilde{v}} < \iota} \frac{r_{\gamma l_1} r_{l_{\widetilde{v}} \iota} r_{\iota k_1} r_{k_v \mu} s_{\mu\gamma}}{(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{l_{\widetilde{v}} l_{\widetilde{v}}})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{k_1 k_1})(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\mu\mu})} \cdot \\ & \cdot \prod_{u=1}^{v-1} \frac{r_{k_u k_{u+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{k_{u+1} k_{u+1}}} \prod_{\widetilde{u}=1}^{\widetilde{v}-1} \frac{r_{l_{\widetilde{u}} l_{\widetilde{u}+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota} - r_{l_{\widetilde{u}} l_{\widetilde{u}}}} \Bigg] \Bigg], \end{aligned}$$

and take $r_{\iota\iota}$ to equal $x_{\iota\iota}$. Then a quadruple (r, s, i, j) satisfying such conditions, whose B-orbit closure contains the unique point $(\mathrm{diag}(x_{\iota\iota}), \mathrm{diag}(y_{\iota\iota}), 0, 0)$, will map to $(x_{11}, \ldots, x_{nn}, y_{11}, \ldots, y_{nn})$. □

5. The coordinate ring of the rss-locus

We will prove that the coordinate ring of the affine quotient $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}/\!\!/B$ is isomorphic to the coordinate ring of pairwise diagonal matrices in $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$.

5.1. **Changing coordinates.**

Definition 5.1. *Let $(a_{\iota\gamma})$ be a matrix.* Level k subdiagonal entries *consist of those coordinates $a_{\iota\gamma}$ below the main diagonal that satisfy $\iota - \gamma = k$.*

Example 5.2. *For an $n \times n$ matrix, level 0 subdiagonal entries are precisely those along the main diagonal. Level 1 subdiagonal entries are those immediately below the main diagonal. Level $n-1$ subdiagonal entry is the $(n,1)$-entry, in the lower left corner.*

In the next Proposition, we prove that for $\iota > \gamma$, $(\mu(r,s,i,j))_{\iota\gamma}$ may be solved for the coordinate function $s_{\iota\gamma}$, which depends on those s_{ij} satisfying $i-j > \iota - \gamma$. That is, each $s_{\iota\gamma}$ is a regular function of s_{ij}'s in level k subdiagonal, where $k > \iota - \gamma$.

Proposition 5.3. *For each $\iota > \gamma$, the coordinate function $([r,s]+ij)_{\iota\gamma}$ may be solved for $s_{\iota\gamma}$, which is in*

$$\mathrm{Im}\left(\mathbb{C}[\{r_{\iota j}\}_{\iota<j}, \{r_{i\gamma}\}_{i<\gamma}, \{s_{ij}\}_{i-j>\iota-\gamma}, x_\iota, y_\gamma][(r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma})^{-1}] \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}]\right).$$

Proof. For $\iota > \gamma$, the sequence of equalities

$$0 = ([r,s]+ij)_{\iota\gamma} = \sum_{\iota\le j} r_{\iota j}s_{j\gamma} - \sum_{i\le\gamma} s_{\iota i}r_{i\gamma} + x_\iota y_\gamma = (r_{\iota\iota} - r_{\gamma\gamma})s_{\iota\gamma} + \sum_{\iota<j} r_{\iota j}s_{j\gamma} - \sum_{i<\gamma} s_{\iota i}r_{i\gamma} + x_\iota y_\gamma$$

implies

$$s_{\iota\gamma} = \frac{1}{r_{\gamma\gamma} - r_{\iota\iota}}\left(\sum_{\iota<j} r_{\iota j}s_{j\gamma} - \sum_{i<\gamma} s_{\iota i}r_{i\gamma} + x_\iota y_\gamma\right).$$

□

Systematic Procedure (off-diag coords of $\mathbb{C}[\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}]$) 5.4. *We apply Proposition 5.3 starting from level $n-1$ subdiagonal of $[r,s]+ij$, add $(r_{nn}-r_{11})^{-1}$ to, and thus will be able to remove the parameter s_{n1} from, the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}]$. We then move to level $n-2$ subdiagonal and repeat the procedure by adding $(r_{n-1,n-1}-r_{11})^{-1}$ to the ring and then removing $s_{n-1,1}$, and then adding $(r_{nn}-r_{22})^{-1}$ to the coordinate ring and then removing s_{n2}. Continue by moving up to the next subdiagonal.*

Corollary 5.5. *It follows from Proposition 5.3 that $s_{\iota\gamma}$ is in*

$$\mathrm{Im}(\,\mathbb{C}[\{r_{ij}\}_{j>i\ge\iota} \text{ or } {}_{i<j\le\gamma}, \{x_k\}_{k\ge\iota}, \{y_l\}_{l\le\gamma}][\{(r_{ii}-r_{jj})^{-1}\}_{i-j\ge\iota-\gamma}] \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}]\,).$$

Corollary 5.5 shows each $s_{\iota\gamma}$ (where $\iota > \gamma$) may be solved so that it does not depend on any of the entries of $s \in \mathfrak{b}^*$.

Proof. Exhaust Systematic Procedure 5.4 recursively decreasing to the next sublevel (and thus moving closer to the main diagonal). □

Corollary 5.6. *After replacing each parameter $s_{\mu\nu}$ in the coordinate function $([r,s]+ij)_{\iota\iota}$ by recursively applying Systematic Procedure 5.4, we obtain that $([r,s]+ij)_{\iota\iota}$ is in the image*

$$\mathrm{Im}(\mathbb{C}[r_{ij}, \{x_k\}_{k\ge\iota}, \{y_l\}_{l\le\iota}][(r_{ii}-r_{jj})^{-1}] \to \mathbb{C}[\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}]).$$

Proof. This follows from Corollary 5.5 since for each $\iota > \gamma$, $s_{\iota\gamma}$ may be solved so that it is independent of the coordinates of s, and also since $s_{\iota\iota}$ are not constrained under the moment map. □

Corollary 5.7. *Writing $F_\iota := (\mu(r,s,i,j))_{\iota\iota}$, the image under the map given in Corollary 5.6 is*

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_\iota = x_\iota y_\iota &+ \sum_{\mu=\iota+1}^{n}\left(\frac{r_{\iota\mu}x_\mu y_\iota}{r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\mu\mu}} + \sum_{v=1}^{\mu-\iota-1}\sum_{\iota<k_1<\ldots<k_v<\mu}\frac{r_{\iota k_1}r_{k_v\mu}x_\mu y_\iota}{(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{k_1k_1})(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\mu\mu})}\prod_{u=1}^{v-1}\frac{r_{k_uk_{u+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota}-r_{k_{u+1}k_{u+1}}}\right)\\
&+\sum_{\gamma=1}^{\iota-1}\left[\frac{r_{\gamma\iota}x_\iota y_\gamma}{r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\gamma\gamma}} + \sum_{\widetilde{v}=1}^{\iota-\gamma-1}\sum_{\gamma<l_1<\ldots<l_{\widetilde{v}}<\iota}\frac{r_{\gamma l_1}r_{l_{\widetilde{v}}\iota}x_\iota y_\gamma}{(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{l_{\widetilde{v}}l_{\widetilde{v}}})(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\gamma\gamma})}\prod_{\widetilde{u}=1}^{\widetilde{v}-1}\frac{r_{l_{\widetilde{u}}l_{\widetilde{u}+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota}-r_{l_{\widetilde{u}}l_{\widetilde{u}}}}\right.\\
&+\sum_{\mu=\iota+1}^{n}\frac{r_{\gamma\iota}r_{\iota\mu}x_\mu y_\gamma}{(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\gamma\gamma})(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\mu\mu})} + \sum_{\mu=\iota+1}^{n}\sum_{\widetilde{v}=1}^{\iota-\gamma-1}\sum_{\gamma<l_1<\ldots<l_{\widetilde{v}}<\iota}\frac{r_{\gamma l_1}r_{l_{\widetilde{v}}\iota}r_{\iota\mu}x_\mu y_\gamma}{(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{l_{\widetilde{v}}l_{\widetilde{v}}})(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\gamma\gamma})(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\mu\mu})}\prod_{\widetilde{u}=1}^{\widetilde{v}-1}\frac{r_{l_{\widetilde{u}}l_{\widetilde{u}+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota}-r_{l_{\widetilde{u}}l_{\widetilde{u}}}}\\
&+\sum_{\mu=\iota+1}^{n}\sum_{v=1}^{\mu-\iota-1}\sum_{\iota<k_1<\ldots<k_v<\mu}\frac{r_{\gamma\iota}r_{\iota k_1}r_{k_v\mu}x_\mu y_\gamma}{(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\gamma\gamma})(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{k_1k_1})(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\mu\mu})}\prod_{u=1}^{v-1}\frac{r_{k_uk_{u+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota}-r_{k_{u+1}k_{u+1}}}\\
&+\sum_{\mu=\iota+1}^{n}\sum_{v=1}^{\mu-\iota-1}\sum_{\iota<k_1<\ldots<k_v<\mu}\sum_{\widetilde{v}=1}^{\iota-\gamma-1}\sum_{\gamma<l_1<\ldots<l_{\widetilde{v}}<\iota}\frac{r_{\gamma l_1}r_{l_{\widetilde{v}}\iota}r_{\iota k_1}r_{k_v\mu}x_\mu y_\gamma}{(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{l_{\widetilde{v}}l_{\widetilde{v}}})(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\gamma\gamma})(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{k_1k_1})(r_{\iota\iota}-r_{\mu\mu})}\cdot\\
&\qquad\left.\prod_{u=1}^{v-1}\frac{r_{k_uk_{u+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota}-r_{k_{u+1}k_{u+1}}}\prod_{\widetilde{u}=1}^{\widetilde{v}-1}\frac{r_{l_{\widetilde{u}}l_{\widetilde{u}+1}}}{r_{\iota\iota}-r_{l_{\widetilde{u}}l_{\widetilde{u}}}}\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

which is compactly written as $jL^\iota i$ with L^ι as defined in Notation 2.2.

5.2. **B-invariant functions.** We will show that B-invariant functions on $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$ include F_ι (involving r, i, and j) as in Proposition 5.8, G_ι (involving r and s) as in Proposition 5.9, H_ι (involving r) as in Proposition 5.10, and $K_{\gamma\nu}$ (involving the inverse of the difference of the diagonal coordinates of r) as in Proposition 5.12. They are summarized in the box

$$
\boxed{\begin{aligned}
F_\iota(r,s,i,j) &= \operatorname{tr}(jL^\iota i)\\
G_\iota(r,s,i,j) &= \operatorname{tr}(L^\iota s)\\
H_\iota(r,s,i,j) &= \operatorname{tr}(L^\iota r)\\
K_{\gamma\nu}(r,s,i,j) &= [\operatorname{tr}((L^\nu - L^\gamma)r)]^{-1}\\
&\qquad \text{where } 1\le \iota\le n \text{ and } 1\le\gamma<\nu\le n.
\end{aligned}}
$$

The rational functions above coincide with the classical notion that the trace of an oriented cycle (of a quiver) as well as the trace of a path that begin and end at a framed vertex is an invariant function ([LBP90], [CB01], [Lus98]). Furthermore, the strategy to calculate semi-invariant polynomials is given in the proof of Proposition 8.2.1 in the Appendix by Gan and Ginzburg ([GG06]); these techniques apply to Nakajima's affine varieties $\mathfrak{M}_0(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$ and quiver varieties $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$ ([Nak98]).

Proposition 5.8. *Denoting $F_\iota(r,s,i,j) := ([r,s]+ij)_{\iota\iota}$ from Corollary 5.7,*

$$
F_\iota(r,s,i,j) = \left[\operatorname{tr}\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n,k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right)\right]^{-1}\operatorname{tr}\left(j\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n,k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right)i\right)
$$

is B-invariant.

Proof. For any $d\in B$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_\iota(d.(r,s,i,j)) &= \operatorname{tr}(jd^{-1}L^\iota(d.r)di)\\
&= \operatorname{tr}(jd^{-1}\,dL^\iota(r)d^{-1}\,di) \text{ by Lemma 2.10}\\
&= \operatorname{tr}(jL^\iota(r)i) = F_\iota(r,s,i,j).
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Proposition 5.9. *Denoting $G_\iota(r,s,i,j) := s'_{\iota\iota}$ from Proposition 1.2,*

$$G_\iota(r,s,i,j) = \left[\operatorname{tr}\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right)\right]^{-1} \operatorname{tr}\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\; s\right)$$

is B-invariant.

Proof. For any $d \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned} G_\iota(d.(r,s,i,j)) &= \operatorname{tr}(L^\iota(d.r)dsd^{-1}) \\ &= \operatorname{tr}(dL^\iota(r)d^{-1}\, dsd^{-1}) \text{ by Lemma 2.10} \\ &= \operatorname{tr}(dL^\iota(r)sd^{-1}) \\ &= \operatorname{tr}(L^\iota(r)s) = G_\iota(r,s,i,j). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 5.10. *Denoting $H_\iota(r,s,i,j) := r_{\iota\iota}$ from Proposition 2.13,*

$$H_\iota(r,s,i,j) = \left[\operatorname{tr}\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\right)\right]^{-1} \operatorname{tr}\left(\prod_{1\le k\le n, k\neq\iota} l_k(r)\; r\right)$$

is B-invariant.

Proof. This proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 5.9: to prove this Proposition, we would need to replace s with r. □

Corollary 5.11. *$H_\iota(r,s,i,j)$ in Proposition 5.10 may be written as $e_\iota^*\, r\, e_\iota$, where e_ι is the standard basis vector for $\mathbb{C}^n$ and e_ι^* is an elementary covector.*

Proof. This is clear, and the product $e_\iota^*\, r\, e_\iota$ of matrices is B-invariant since for any $d \in B$, $(drd^{-1})_{\iota\iota} = d_{\iota\iota} r_{\iota\iota} d_{\iota\iota}^{-1} = r_{\iota\iota}$. □

Proposition 5.12. *Denoting $K_{\gamma\nu}(r,s,i,j) := (r_{\nu\nu} - r_{\gamma\gamma})^{-1}$ from Proposition 2.14, where $1 \le \gamma < \nu \le n$,*

$$K_{\gamma\nu}(r,s,i,j) = [\operatorname{tr}((L^\nu - L^\gamma)r)]^{-1}$$

is B-invariant.

Proof. For any $1 \le \gamma < \nu \le n$,

$$(K_{\gamma\nu}(r,s,i,j))^{-1} = \operatorname{tr}(L^\nu r - L^\gamma r) = \underbrace{\operatorname{tr}(L^\nu r)}_{B-\text{inv}} - \underbrace{\operatorname{tr}(L^\gamma r)}_{B-\text{inv}}$$

implies $(K_{\gamma\nu})^{-1}$ is B-invariant. Since it is never vanishing, $K_{\gamma\nu}$ is B-invariant. □

Corollary 5.13. *$K_{\gamma\nu}(r,s,i,j)$ in Proposition 5.12 may be written as $(e_\nu^*(r - r_{\gamma\gamma}\,\mathrm{I}_n)e_\nu)^{-1}$, where e_ν is the standard basis vector for $\mathbb{C}^n$ and e_ν^* is its dual.*

Proof. This is clear, and the product of matrices $(e_\nu^*(r - r_{\gamma\gamma}\,\mathrm{I}_n)e_\nu)^{-1}$ is B-invariant since for any $d \in B$ and for any $\gamma < \nu$, $(d(r - r_{\gamma\gamma}\,\mathrm{I}_n)d^{-1})_{\nu\nu} = (drd^{-1} - r_{\gamma\gamma}\,\mathrm{I}_n)_{\nu\nu} = (drd^{-1})_{\nu\nu} - (r_{\gamma\gamma}\,\mathrm{I}_n)_{\nu\nu} = r_{\nu\nu} - r_{\gamma\gamma}$, which is never zero; so its inverse is well-defined. □

5.3. **The initial ideal and regular sequence.**

Notation 5.14. *We will define $z_{ij}^{(kl)} := \dfrac{r_{kl}}{r_{ii} - r_{jj}}$ for $i \neq j$.*

Remark (Weight Function) 5.15. *Using Notation 5.14, the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[x_k, y_l, z_{ij}^{(kl)}]$ has the following integral weight on each variable:* $\operatorname{wt}(x_k) = 1, \operatorname{wt}(y_l) = 1, \operatorname{wt}(z_{ij}^{(kl)}) = 0$.

Weighted Monomial Order 5.16. *We fix a term order $>$ on $\mathbb{C}[x_k, y_l, z_{ij}^{(kl)}]$ via the following refinement: write*

$$m = x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} y_n^{b_n} \cdots y_1^{b_1} (z_{ij}^{(kl)})^{c_{ij}^{(kl)}} >_{\text{lex,rev}} x_1^{a_1'} \cdots x_n^{a_n'} y_n^{b_n'} \cdots y_1^{b_1'} (z_{ij}^{(kl)})^{c_{ij}^{(kl)'}} = m'$$

if

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_n, \ldots, b_1, c_{ij}^{(kl)}) - (a_1', \ldots, a_n', b_n', \ldots, b_1', c_{ij}^{(kl)'}) > 0$$

in the sense that the left-most nonzero coordinate of the difference of the exponent vector is positive.

We impose any ordering on the $z_{ij}^{(kl)}$ as long as they succeed the ordering on the x_ι's and the y_γ's; thus, we will view them as constants, which coincide with their weights as imposed in Remark 5.15.

We will write $>$ rather than $>_{\text{lex,rev}}$ throughout this section.

Remark 5.17. *Total ordering by total degree in Monomial Ordering 5.16 does not need to be mentioned since each F_ι is a homogeneous quadratic function. Furthermore, if we want to view $z_{ij}^{(kl)}$ as a rational function (rather than as a constant) and impose an ordering, one may define such ordering by $\frac{f_1}{f_2} > \frac{g_1}{g_2}$ if $f_1 g_2 > f_2 g_1$.*

Note that we have imposed lexicographical order on the x_i's, and reversed the indices on the y_i's and applied lex on the y_i's (caution: this is not the same as reverse lex order since that has infinite descending sequences; thus it is not a monomial order), with the ordering on the x_i's preceding the y_i's. Monomial Ordering 5.16 of $\mathbb{C}[x_k, y_l, z_{ij}^{(kl)}]$ is multiplicative (i.e., if $m > m'$, then $m\widetilde{m} > m'\widetilde{m}$) and artinian ($m > 1$ for all nonunit monomials m).

Lemma 5.18. *With respect to Monomial Ordering 5.16, the initial term $\text{In}(F_\iota)$ of each F_ι equals $x_\iota y_\iota$.*

Proof. Since each monomial corresponds to a unique exponent vector, write the exponents of each monomial of F_ι as a pair of multi-indices $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_n)$, i.e., $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ may be thought of as column vectors living in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ (for the time being, we omit keeping track of $z_{ij}^{(kl)}$). It is clear by Corollary 5.7 that both $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ are in $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$, where e_i is the standard basis vector for $\mathbb{Z}^n$, since exactly one of the exponents for x_γ's and one of the exponents for y_ν's are nonzero for each monomial of F_ι. Since the degree of each monomial of F_ι is 2, higher powers of x_γ or y_ν cannot occur.

Now for a fixed F_ι, we inspect the monomials in Corollary 5.7 to conclude the inclusion of sets

$$\{\mathbf{a} : \mathbf{a} \text{ is the multi-index of some monomial of } F_\iota\} \supseteq \{e_\iota, \ldots, e_n\}.$$

The vector $\mathbf{a}$ corresponding to the first term $x_\iota y_\iota$ is e_ι while all the other summations show that $\mathbf{a}$ is in $\{e_{\iota+1}, \ldots, e_n\}$. When $\mathbf{a} = e_\iota$, the possibilities for its corresponding $\mathbf{b}$-vector take on all values $e_1, \ldots, e_\iota$, which one may check by looking at the monomials in Corollary 5.7. In order to determine the leading term, if $\mathbf{a} = e_\alpha$, we want α to be as small as possible since we have imposed lex on the x_γ's, and if $\mathbf{b} = e_\beta$, we want β to be as big as possible since we have imposed a reverse ordering on the y_ν's. Since $x_\iota y_\iota$ occurs once in F_ι with coefficient 1 with $c_{ij}^{(kl)} = 0$, the initial term of F_ι is $x_\iota y_\iota$. □

Lemma 5.19. *The initial terms of $\{F_\iota\}_{1 \leq \iota \leq n}$ form a regular sequence.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 5.18. □

Lemma 5.20. *The set $\{F_\iota\}_{1 \leq \iota \leq n}$ of functions is $\mathbb{C}[T^*(\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{C}^n)^{rss}]$-regular.*

Proof. The F_ι's form a regular sequence since their initial terms form a regular sequence by Proposition 15.15 in [Eis95]. □

6. Proof of Proposition 1.5

The following proves Proposition 1.5.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{C}[\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}] &= \mathbb{C}[T^*(\mathfrak{b}\times\mathbb{C}^n)^{rss}]/\langle\,(\mu(r,s,i,j))_{\iota\gamma}\,\rangle\\ &\cong \frac{\mathbb{C}[r_{\alpha\beta},\,x_k,\,y_l][(r_{\nu\nu}-r_{\gamma\gamma})^{-1}]}{\langle\,([r,s]+ij)_{\iota\iota}\,\rangle}\otimes\mathbb{C}[s_{11},\dots,s_{nn}]\\ &= \frac{\mathbb{C}[r_{\alpha\beta},\,x_k,\,y_l][(r_{\nu\nu}-r_{\gamma\gamma})^{-1}]}{\langle\,F_\iota(r,s,i,j)\,\rangle}\otimes\mathbb{C}[s_{11},\dots,s_{nn}],\end{aligned}$$

where the second isomorphism holds by Corollary 5.6 and the third equality holds by Corollary 5.7. The locus $\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}$ is a complete intersection by Lemma 5.20. By Propositions 5.8, 5.9, 5.10, and 5.12,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{C}[\mu^{-1}(0)^{rss}]^B &= \frac{\mathbb{C}\left[F_\iota(r,s,i,j),G_\iota(r,s,i,j),H_\iota(r,s,i,j)\right]\left[K_{\gamma\nu}(r,s,i,j)\right]}{\langle F_\iota(r,s,i,j)\rangle}\\ &\cong \mathbb{C}\left[r_{11},\dots,r_{nn},s'_{11},\dots,s'_{nn}\right]\left[(r_{\nu\nu}-r_{\gamma\gamma})^{-1}\right]\\ &\cong \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{C}^{2n}\setminus\Delta_n].\end{aligned}$$

□

References

[CB01] William Crawley-Boevey, *Geometry of the moment map for representations of quivers*, Compositio Math. **126** (2001), no. 3, 257–293.

[CG10] Neil Chriss and Victor Ginzburg, *Representation theory and complex geometry*, Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2010, Reprint of the 1997 edition.

[Eis95] David Eisenbud, *Commutative algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 150, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995, With a view toward algebraic geometry.

[GG06] Wee Liang Gan and Victor Ginzburg, *Almost-commuting variety, $\mathscr{D}$-modules, and Cherednik algebras*, IMRP Int. Math. Res. Pap. (2006), 26439, 1–54, With an appendix by Ginzburg.

[Gin98] Victor Ginzburg, *Geometric methods in the representation theory of Hecke algebras and quantum groups*, Representation theories and algebraic geometry (Montreal, PQ, 1997), NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci., vol. 514, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1998, Notes by Vladimir Baranovsky [V. Yu. Baranovskiĭ], pp. 127–183.

[Gin09] ———, *Lectures on Nakajima's quiver varieties*, `http://arxiv.org/pdf/0905.0686v2`, 2009.

[Im14] Mee Seong Im, *On semi-invariants of filtered representations of quivers and the cotangent bundle of the enhanced Grothendieck-Springer resolution*, `https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/handle/2142/49392`, 2014.

[KL09] Mikhail Khovanov and Aaron D. Lauda, *A diagrammatic approach to categorification of quantum groups. I*, Represent. Theory **13** (2009), 309–347.

[KL11] ———, *A diagrammatic approach to categorification of quantum groups II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **363** (2011), no. 5, 2685–2700.

[LBP90] Lieven Le Bruyn and Claudio Procesi, *Semisimple representations of quivers*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **317** (1990), no. 2, 585–598.

[Lus90a] G. Lusztig, *Canonical bases arising from quantized enveloping algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1990), no. 2, 447–498.

[Lus90b] ———, *Canonical bases arising from quantized enveloping algebras. II*, Progr. Theoret. Phys. Suppl. (1990), no. 102, 175–201 (1991), Common trends in mathematics and quantum field theories (Kyoto, 1990).

[Lus98] ———, *On quiver varieties*, Adv. Math. **136** (1998), no. 1, 141–182.

[Lus00] ———, *Semicanonical bases arising from enveloping algebras*, Adv. Math. **151** (2000), no. 2, 129–139.

[Nak98] Hiraku Nakajima, *Quiver varieties and Kac-Moody algebras*, Duke Math. J. **91** (1998), no. 3, 515–560.

[Nak99] ———, *Lectures on Hilbert schemes of points on surfaces*, University Lecture Series, vol. 18, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.

[Nev11] Thomas Nevins, *Stability and Hamiltonian reduction for Grothendieck-Springer resolutions*, `http://www.math.uiuc.edu/~nevins/papers/b-hamiltonian-reduction-2011-0316.pdf`, 2011.

[Rou08] Raphael Rouquier, *2-Kac-Moody algebras*, `http://arxiv.org/pdf/0812.5023v1`, 2008.

[SW11] Catharina Stroppel and Ben Webster, *Quiver Schur algebras and q-Fock space*, `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1110.1115`, 2011.

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801 USA
E-mail address: `mim2@illinois.edu`